to discover, is, that some few of the professed Pagans, as well as of pretended Christians, have indeed asserted a duplicity of such gods (viz. understanding beings unmade), one good, and the other evil, but no more. Whereas, on the coiv trary, we have found, that Aristotle did professedly oppose this opinion of many principles, or unmade gods, which certainly he durst never have done, had it then been the generally-received opinion of the Pagans. And though it be true, that several of the ancient Christians, in their disputes with Pagans, do confute that opinion of many unmade deities ; yet we do not find, for all that, that any of them seriously charge the Pagans with it, they only doing it occasionally and *ex abundanti.* But we should be the better enabled to make a clear judgment concerning this controversy, whether there were not amongst the Pagan deities a multitude of supposed unmade beings, if we did but take a short survey of their religion, and consider all the several kinds of gods worshipped by them; which may, as we conceive, be reduced to these folio wing heads:—In the first place, therefore, it is certain, that many of the Pagan gods were nothing else but dead men (or the souls of men deceased), called by the Greeks Heroes, and the Latins Manes; such as Hercules, Liber, JEsculapius, Castor, Pollux, Quirinus, and the like. Neither was this only true of the Greeks and Romans, but also of the Egyptians, Syrians, and Babylonians. For which cause the Pagan sacrifices are, by way of contempt,, in the Scriptnre,[a] called the sacrifices of the dead ; that is, not of dead or lifeless statues, as some

[a] Psalm cvi. 28.